

1 THE HONORABLE ROBERT S. LASNIK
2
3
4
5
6
7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10
AT SEATTLE

11 KAELI GARNER,, et al., Individually and on)
12 Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,) No. 2:21-cv-00750-RSL
13 Plaintiffs,) (Consolidated)
14 vs.)
15 AMAZON.COM, INC., et al.,) **CLASS ACTION**
16 Defendants.)
17) **PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR IN
CAMERA REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS
CLAWED BACK OUT OF TIME**
18)
19) **NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:**
20) March 15, 2024
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)
26)

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR IN CAMERA
REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS CLAWED BACK
OUT OF TIME (2:21-cv-00750-RSL)

BYRNES KELLER CROMWELL LLP
1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: 206/622-2000• Fax: 206/622-2522

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS
2

	Page
3 BACKGROUND	1
4 A. Defendants' Document Productions	1
5 B. Defendants' Clawbacks and Additional Privilege Logs	2
6 C. Defendants' History of Resisting Discovery	3
7 ARGUMENT	4
8 A. Defendants' Clawbacks Are Untimely	4
9 B. Multiple Reviews Identified No Privileged Material	5
10 C. Defendants' Policies of [REDACTED] Support Additional Review	6
11 D. Plaintiffs' Requested Relief	7
12 CONCLUSION	8
13 LOCAL RULE 37(a)(1) CERTIFICATION	8

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

2	Page
3	
4	CASES
5	<i>Fisher v. United States</i> , 425 U.S. 391 (1976).....7
6	<i>Hart v. TWC Prod. & Tech. LLC</i> , No. 20CV03842JSTJSC, 2022 WL 1529407 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2022).....6
7	
8	<i>In re Grand Jury</i> , 23 F.4th 1088 (9th Cir. 2021)7
9	
10	<i>In re Grand Jury Investigation</i> , 974 F.2d 1068 (9th Cir. 1992)4, 5, 6, 7
11	
12	<i>In re: Grand Jury Subpoena (Mark Torf/Torf Env't Mgmt.)</i> , 357 F.3d 900 (9th Cir. 2004)6
13	
14	<i>L.D. v. United Behavioral Health</i> , No. 20CV02254YGRJCS, 2022 WL 3139520 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 5, 2022)4
15	
16	STATUTES, RULES, AND REGULATIONS
17	Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 30(b)(6).....1
18	Local Rule 37(A)(1).....8

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR IN CAMERA
REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS CLAWED BACK
OUT OF TIME

BYRNES KELLER CROMWELL LLP
1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: 206/622-2000• Fax: 206/622-2522

1 Plaintiffs file this Motion to request in camera review of a small, representative sampling
 2 of the hundreds of documents clawed back by Defendants (the “Clawed Back Documents”) which
 3 were rescinded well past the deadline for compliance with this Court’s September 15, 2023 Order
 4 Granting Plaintiffs’ Motion To Compel, ECF 211 (“September Order”). Plaintiffs seek such a
 5 review because the Clawed Back Documents were reviewed multiple times by attorneys for
 6 Defendants and then, following Defendants’ production, by Plaintiffs. In reviewing the documents
 7 produced, Plaintiffs’ counsel did not identify any indicia of privilege on any of the Clawed Back
 8 Documents. After undertaking their review process, Plaintiffs belatedly learned that Defendants
 9 were again reviewing the documents and, shortly before noticed depositions were set to begin,
 10 Defendants sent notification that nearly two thousand documents were being clawed back.

11 Defendants’ belated clawback of these produced documents is substantially likely to
 12 impact Plaintiffs’ ability to take depositions—specifically, the deposition of Defendants’ corporate
 13 designee under Rule 30(b)(6), which the Parties have already agreed to take after the close of
 14 discovery. This is not the first instance of Defendants’ conduct significantly impacting discovery
 15 in this matter. *See September Order at 9.* Moreover, Defendants have a policy of [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED] raising significant concerns regarding the
 17 completeness of the production in this privacy case. An in camera review is warranted because of
 18 the substantial likelihood that many, if not most, of the Clawed Back Documents are business
 19 documents and not privileged.

20 **BACKGROUND**

21 **A. Defendants’ Document Productions.**

22 Defendants’ initial review of the documents returned by the search terms ordered by this
 23 Court resulted in a production of only 2,564 documents due to Defendants’ myopic view of the
 24 claims at issue in this case. September Order at 6. Defendants produced multiple privilege logs
 25 during this period. Cohen Decl. at 2. Defendants stated that this review took 63,000 hours to
 26 complete. September Order at 9. This Court determined that Defendants “used an unreasonably

1 narrow view of what was relevant" in that review and ordered Defendants to either produce all the
 2 documents returned by the search terms or to redo the relevance review and complete production
 3 within thirty-five days of the Court's order. *Id.* Defendants chose the latter.

4 By October 31, 2023, Defendants made multiple document productions that purported to
 5 fulfill the Court's order. Defendants also produced multiple privilege logs on a rolling basis, three
 6 after the October 31 production and only weeks, or in some cases days, before depositions were
 7 scheduled to begin. Plaintiffs' attorneys began reviewing the newly produced documents and
 8 privilege logs immediately to glean any information that would explain the 4,522 privilege
 9 designations, notice and prepare for depositions before the close of discovery on February 27,
 10 2024, as well as to prepare for class certification and summary judgment.

11 **B. Defendants' Clawbacks and Additional Privilege Logs.**

12 On December 20, 2023, two months after the deadline for production set by this Court,
 13 Defendants notified Plaintiffs that "content in the documents listed in Attachment A to this letter
 14 are subject to the attorney-client and/or work product privilege and were inadvertently produced."
 15 Cohen Decl. Ex. 1. Defendants stated that these documents were privileged because they included
 16 "confidential communications between Amazon and its in-house and/or outside attorneys for the
 17 purpose of obtaining or providing legal advice." Cohen Decl. Ex. 1. Attachment A listed 1,997
 18 documents. Cohen Decl. Ex. 2. During a January 23, 2024 meet and confer, Defendants stated that
 19 they were not willing to review the clawback list but would produce a privilege log for all Clawed
 20 Back Documents created after *Hall-O'Neil*, as stipulated in the parties' Agreement Regarding
 21 Discovery of Electronically Stored Information. ECF 89 at 10. The Sixth Supplemental Privilege
 22 Log, produced on January 05, 2024, listed 113 documents. Cohen Decl. at 2.

23 On January 5, 2024, Defendants sent Plaintiffs an Amended Attachment A. Cohen Decl.
 24 Ex. 4. Defendants' cover letter stated that Defendants "identified additional privileged documents
 25 that were inadvertently produced as well as approximately 250 documents that were mistakenly
 26 included in our December 20, 2023 letter." Cohen Decl. Ex. 3. Amended Attachment A listed

1 1,741 documents. Cohen Decl. Ex. 4. Plaintiffs again requested, on January 22, 2024, that
 2 Defendants review the amended clawback list and deescalate documents, but Defendants declined
 3 to do so.

4 On January 29, 2024, Defendants produced a Seventh Supplemental Privilege Log, listing
 5 1,220 documents. Cohen Decl. at 2. On February 1, 2024, Defendants purportedly sent Plaintiffs
 6 a Second Amended Attachment A, downgrading 51 “duplicate[]” documents and clawing back
 7 one additional document.¹ Cohen Decl. Ex. 5. The final number of Clawed Back Documents
 8 impacted totals approximately 2,055.

9 **C. Defendants’ History of Resisting Discovery.**

10 Plaintiffs have several concerns regarding Defendants’ privilege designations. First,
 11 Defendants’ multiple late stage clawback notices came two months after this Court’s order to
 12 produce the relevant documents. Indeed, the documents were clawed back as Plaintiffs diligently
 13 worked to review hundreds of thousands of documents and to prepare for depositions to avoid
 14 having to extend discovery for a fourth time due to Defendants’ delay.

15 Second, Defendants’ own documents highlight concerning internal policies that appear to
 16 promote resisting discovery requests by various means, including [REDACTED]

17 For example, a July 2021 [REDACTED] produced following the September Order
 18 illustrates one such policy. Cohen Decl. Ex. 6. There, Defendants’ employees were instructed to
 19 [REDACTED]

20 [REDACTED] *Id.* at 2. Only after [REDACTED]

21 [REDACTED]
 22 [REDACTED] *Id.* Even if these documents contain some privileged
 23 information—and they may not—there is a substantial likelihood that each document contains at
 24

25
 26 ¹ The February 1 email from Defendants did not include a copy of this spreadsheet, and
 Plaintiffs’ have been unable to locate a copy after a diligent search.

1 least a mix of business and legal information. Documents containing some business information
 2 could and should have been produced in redacted form.

3 This issue, involving a nearly identical policy related to documents regarding “clarity”
 4 instead of [REDACTED] like in this case, is currently before another judge in this district in *FTC v.*
 5 *Amazon, Inc.*, 2:23-cv-00932-JHC (W.D. Wash.). Documents made public in that case show
 6 Defendants’ policy of marking all documents related to “clarity” as privileged and confidential.
 7 Cohen Decl. Ex. 7 at 3. An example from October 2020, squarely within the relevant timeframe
 8 of this case, shows a director adding an attorney to an email chain with only the comment “+ Susan
 9 [the attorney], making P&C, seeking legal guidance. Team, let’s please keep Clarity
 10 communications as P&C. thx.” Cohen Decl. Ex. 7 at 3–4. Defendants have produced multiple
 11 documents with various forms of [REDACTED] in the instant case as well. *See, e.g.*, Cohen
 12 Decl. Ex. 8.

13 ARGUMENT

14 In camera review is appropriate when the party seeking review can “show a factual basis
 15 sufficient to support a reasonable, good faith belief that in camera inspection may reveal evidence
 16 that information in the materials is not privileged.” *In re Grand Jury Investigation*, 974 F.2d 1068,
 17 1075 (9th Cir. 1992). The threshold showing required to justify in camera review is “not high.”
 18 *L.D. v. United Behavioral Health*, No. 20CV02254YGRJCS, 2022 WL 3139520, at *11 (N.D. Cal.
 19 Aug. 5, 2022).

20 A. Defendants’ Clawbacks Are Untimely.

21 The timing of Defendants’ first clawback request—two months after the deadline set by
 22 this Court to redo its relevance review—provides a factual basis to believe that many, if not most,
 23 of the Clawed Back Documents are business, not legal, documents. The second review was
 24 prompted by Plaintiffs’ motion to compel production of documents already produced to the Federal
 25 Trade Commission. September Order at 1. Defendants “only object[ed] to producing documents
 26 where the FTC matter and this case do not overlap.” Def. Opp. To Pls.’ Motion to Compel, ECF

1 185 at 7. In other words, Defendants' *sole* objection to production of the documents it produced to
 2 the FTC and not to Plaintiffs was relevance.

3 This Court was unconvinced by Defendants' arguments and determined that Defendants
 4 used "an unreasonably narrow view of what was relevant" in its entire relevance review. This
 5 Court ordered Defendants to choose between completing a second relevance review or turning
 6 over these documents immediately without respect to their responsiveness. September Order at 9.
 7 When Defendants choose to review these documents again, it was given a second opportunity at a
 8 privilege review, even though a portion of these documents had already been produced to the FTC
 9 and Defendants already argued that the only reason they were withheld was due to lack of
 10 relevance.

11 Instead, Defendants waited two months, half of the time remaining for discovery, to issue
 12 a massive clawback request. A reasonable person could believe that a portion of these Clawed
 13 Back Documents were among those produced to the FTC, and that in camera inspection will
 14 therefore "reveal evidence that information in the materials is not privileged." *In re Grand Jury*
 15 *Investigation*, 974 F.2d at 1075.

16 **B. Multiple Reviews Identified No Privileged Material.**

17 Prior to Defendants' untimely notice, Plaintiffs' counsel reviewed a substantial portion of
 18 the Clawed Back Documents—in many cases multiple times—and did not identify any privileged
 19 material. And before Plaintiffs even received the Clawed Back Documents, Defendants' attorneys
 20 conducted their own review (and were in possession of the documents for over two years) prior to
 21 the September Order. The Clawed Back Documents were again reviewed by Defendants' attorneys
 22 following the September Order and found to be appropriate for production. Finally, nearly a third
 23 of the Clawed Back Documents were reviewed by Plaintiffs' attorneys in the two months before
 24 receipt of the first clawback letter and sequestering of the Clawed Back Documents. None of those
 25 attorneys found any indicia of privileged content.

1 As the party asserting the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine to withhold
 2 the Clawed Back Documents, Defendants have the burden of proving the privileges apply. *In re*
 3 *Grand Jury Investigation*, 974 F.2d at 1070. The fact that a finished document “reflects,” or
 4 incorporates, attorney input does not make the document itself a privileged communication. *See*,
 5 *e.g.*, *Hart v. TWC Prod. & Tech. LLC*, No. 20CV03842JSTJSC, 2022 WL 1529407, at *2 (N.D.
 6 Cal. Apr. 11, 2022) (fact that a policy “may have been developed with input from attorneys does
 7 not make emails reflecting what the policy actually is privileged”).

8 To support Defendants’ claim that multiple documents also contain attorney work product,
 9 Defendants must establish the documents were prepared “in anticipation of litigation,” which
 10 means the document must have been “created because of anticipated litigation, and would not have
 11 been created in substantially similar form but for the prospect of that litigation.” *In re: Grand Jury*
 12 *Subpoena (Mark Torf/Torf Env’t Mgmt.)*, 357 F.3d 900, 907–08 (9th Cir. 2004) (citation omitted).
 13 “When there is a true independent purpose for creating a document, work product protection is
 14 less likely” *Id.* at 908.

15 Under the Agreement Regarding Discovery of Electronically Stored Information, Plaintiffs
 16 agreed to return any information protected as privileged or work product. ECF 89 at 10. If any
 17 such information had been identified during the review, it would have been brought to Defendants’
 18 attention. No such information was identified by Plaintiffs’ attorneys, just as it was not identified
 19 by Defendants’ attorneys in their two reviews.

20 **C. Defendants’ Policies of [REDACTED] Support Additional Review.**

21 Defendants’ stated policies for [REDACTED]

22 [REDACTED] is well-documented and provides an additional factual basis
 23 for Plaintiffs’ good faith belief that in camera review will reveal that information in the Clawed
 24 Back Documents is not privileged. *See, e.g.*, Cohen Decl. Ex. 6; Ex. 7 at 3. Defendants’ documents
 25 explicitly describe [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED] *Id.* [REDACTED]

1 [REDACTED]
 2 [REDACTED] which is the predominant issue at the heart of this case. Cohen Decl.
 3 Ex. 6 at 2.

4 This is not permissible. Documents are only protected by attorney-client privilege when
 5 their “primary purpose” is “to give or receive legal advice, as opposed to business . . . advice.” *In*
 6 *re Grand Jury*, 23 F.4th 1088, 1091 (9th Cir. 2021). This standard is meant to discourage policies
 7 exactly like Defendants’: “add[ing] layers of lawyers to every business decision in hopes of
 8 insulating themselves from scrutiny in any future litigation.” *Id.* at 1093–94; *see also In re Grand*
 9 *Jury Investigation*, 974 F.2d at 1070 (“To prevent abuse . . . the privilege is limited to ‘only those
 10 *disclosures—necessary to obtain informed legal advice—which might not have been made absent*
 11 *the privilege.’”’) (quoting *Fisher v. United States*, 425 U.S. 391, 403 (1976)).*

12 **D. Plaintiffs’ Requested Relief**

13 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court review a random sample of the Clawed Back
 14 Documents to determine whether they are in fact privileged, or whether they should have been
 15 produced in full or redacted form. To promote efficiency and judicial economy, Plaintiffs propose
 16 the following approaches for the Court to consider: the Court could select 50–100 Clawed Back
 17 Documents to review for privilege at random, or Plaintiffs could select 50–100 Clawed Back
 18 Documents for the Court’s review from the documents that Plaintiffs previously reviewed and
 19 determined to not be privileged.

20 If the Court’s review determines that documents were improperly clawed back because
 21 they are not privileged, or documents should have been produced in redacted form, Plaintiffs
 22 request the Court enter an order permitting Plaintiffs to establish a taint team to review all Clawed
 23 Back Documents, as well as all other documents that Defendants claim are privileged, and
 24 deescalate any that are not privileged. Alternatively, Plaintiffs respectfully request the Court order
 25 a Special Master or the Magistrate Judge assigned to this matter conduct the review.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully requests the Court provide in camera review of a sampling of the Clawed Back Documents.

LOCAL RULE 37(A)(1) CERTIFICATION

5 I certify that counsel for Plaintiffs has in good faith conferred with counsel for Defendants
6 in an effort to resolve this dispute without court action. Counsel for the parties met and conferred
7 by phone on January 23, 2024, and February 26, 2024, with the following attorneys present:
8 Melissa Lawton, Danielle Izzo, and Alexander Cohen (February 26, 2024 only). Counsel also
9 exchanged written correspondence relating to this dispute on January 24, 2024, February 23, 2024,
10 February 26, 2024 and February 27, 2024.

DATED: February 27, 2024

BYRNES KELLER CROMWELL LLP
BRADLEY S. KELLER (WSBA# 10665)

/s/ Bradley S. Keller
BRADLEY S. KELLER

1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: 206/622-2000
206/622-2522 (fax)
bkeller@byrneskeller.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff and the Class

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR IN CAMERA
REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS CLAWED BACK
OUT OF TIME

BYRNES KELLER CROMWELL LLP
1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: 206/622-2000• Fax: 206/622-2522

1 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
2 & DOWD LLP
3 PAUL J. GELLER
4 STUART A. DAVIDSON
5 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
6 MARK J. DEARMAN
7 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
8 ALEXANDER C. COHEN
9 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
10 NICOLLE B. BRITO
11 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
12 225 NE Mizner Boulevard, Suite 720
13 Boca Raton, FL 33432
14 Telephone: 561/750-3000
15 561/750-3364 (fax)
16 pgeller@rgrdlaw.com
17 sdavidson@rgrdlaw.com
18 mdearman@rgrdlaw.com
19 acohen@rgrdlaw.com
20 nbrito@rgrdlaw.com

21 LABATON KELLER SUCHAROW LLP
22 MICHAEL P. CANTY
23 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
24 CAROL C. VILLEGRAS
25 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
26 DAVID SALDAMANDO
27 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
28 GUILLAUME BUELL
29 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
30 THOMAS G. HOFFMAN JR.
31 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
32 140 Broadway, 34th Floor
33 New York, NY 10005
34 Telephone: 212/907-0700
35 212/818-0477 (fax)
36 mcanty@labaton.com
37 villegas@labaton.com
38 dsaldamando@labaton.com
39 gbuell@labaton.com
40 thoffman@labaton.com

41 Interim Co-Lead Class Counsel
42
43
44

45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306

1 BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
2 L. TIMOTHY FISHER
3 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
4 1990 North California Boulevard, Suite 940
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Telephone: 925/300-4455
925/407-2700 (fax)
ltfisher@bursor.com

6 BURSOR & FISHER, P.A.
7 ALEC M. LESLIE
8 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
MAX S. ROBERTS
9 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
888 Seventh Avenue, Third Floor
New York, NY 10019
Telephone: 646/837-7150
212/989-9163 (fax)
aleslie@bursor.com
mroberts@bursor.com

12 ZIMMERMAN REED, LLP
13 BRIAN C. GUDMUNDSON
14 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
15 JASON P. JOHNSTON
16 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
17 MICHAEL J. LAIRD
18 (admitted *pro hac vice*)
19 1100 IDS Center, 80 South 8th Street
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: 612/341-0400
612/341-0844 (fax)
brian.gudmundson@zimmreed.com
jason.johnston@zimmreed.com
michael.laird@zimmreed.com

20 ZIMMERMAN REED LLP
21 CALEB MARKER (admitted *pro hac vice*)
22 2381 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 328
Manhattan Beach, CA 90245
Telephone: 877/500-8780
caleb.marker@zimmreed.com

23
24
25
26
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR IN CAMERA
REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS CLAWED BACK
OUT OF TIME

BYRNES KELLER CROMWELL LLP
1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: 206/622-2000• Fax: 206/622-2522

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN P.L.L.P.
ROBERT K. SHELQUIST
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
REBECCA A. PETERSON
(admitted *pro hac vice*)
100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200
Minneapolis, MN 55401-2159
Telephone: 612/339-6900
612/339-0981 (fax)
rkshelquist@locklaw.com
rapeterson@locklaw.com

Interim Class Counsel

PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR IN CAMERA
REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS CLAWED BACK
OUT OF TIME

BYRNES KELLER CROMWELL LLP
1000 Second Avenue, 38th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone: 206/622-2000• Fax: 206/622-2522